

FILED

2013 DEC 11 PM 4:48

CLERK U.S. DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DIST. OF CALIF.
RIVERSIDE

BY X

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

PACIFICA SEACOVE LP,

Plaintiff,

vs.

DANIEL CARDONA,
JANELLE M. PIETERS-
CARDONA, AND DOES 1-20,

Defendants.

Case No. CV13-8855-UA (DUTY)

ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING
IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION

The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily because it has been removed improperly.

On December 2, 2013, defendant Daniel Cardona, having been sued in what appears to be a routine unlawful detainer action in California state court, lodged a Notice of Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court has denied the latter application under separate cover because the action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

Simply stated, plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first place, in that defendant does not competently allege facts supplying either

1 diversity or federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28
2 U.S.C. §1441(a); see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563,
3 125 S. Ct. 2611, 162 L. Ed. 2d 502 (2005). Even if complete diversity of citizenship
4 exists, the amount in controversy does not exceed the diversity-jurisdiction threshold
5 of \$75,000. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332, 1441(b). On the contrary, the unlawful-detainer
6 complaint recites that the amount in controversy does not exceed \$10,000.

7 Nor does plaintiff's unlawful detainer action raise any federal legal question.
8 See 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1441(b).

9 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the
10 Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, 300 East Walnut Street, Pasadena,
11 CA 91101, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2)
12 that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the state court; and (3) that the
13 Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.


14 IT IS SO ORDERED.

15
16
17 DATED: 12/8/13



GEORGE H. KING
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

18
19 Presented by:

20 
21 _____
22 David T. Bristow
23 United States Magistrate Judge
24
25
26
27
28